

REMARKS

Summary

In this Office Action, claims 21-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In response, claims 21 and 29 have been amended, placing said claims and claims 22-28, 30, and 32, which depend from one of claims 21 and 29, in condition of allowance. Claim 30 has also been amended to comport with the amendments to claims 21 and 29. Support for the amendments is found throughout the originally submitted application. No new matter has been added. In addition, claim 31 has been canceled.

Thus, claims 21-30, and 32 presently are pending.

Attorney Docket Number

Please change Attorney Docket No. to 107773-132358.

Rejections under § 103: *Begis/Morley*

In this Office Action, claims 21-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,907,034 issued to Begis (hereinafter "*Begis*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,985,589 issued to Morley et al. (hereinafter "*Morley*"). In response and as noted above, claim 42 has been canceled thereby rendering moot the rejection thereof. In addition, claims 21 and 29 have been amended thereby placing said claims and claims 22-28, 30, and 32, which depend from one of claims 21 and 29, in condition of allowance.

Claim 21, as amended, recites an apparatus for use at a local site comprising:

- an adapter configured to couple the apparatus to a voice network;
- an input key coupled to the adapter and configured, upon actuation, to initiate a negotiation procedure to procure an access code via the voice network;
- a network interface configured to couple the apparatus to a data network to provide a data network session of a data conference based at least in part on the access code; and

an image processor coupled to the network interface and configured to communicate image data with the network interface;
a projector for displaying an image based at least in part on image data transmitted over the data network from a remote dataconferencing apparatus at a remote site, the projector configured to display the image;
and
a housing adapted to incorporate the adapter, the input key, the network interface, the image processor, and the projector into an integrated dataconferencing apparatus.

Thus, the invention as claimed comprises, among other things, a projector for displaying an image generated by a remote dataconferencing apparatus substantially concurrently with generation of the image at the remote site. This novel apparatus simply displays the image generated by the remote apparatus and thus does not require software for said displaying. Furthermore, this desktop solution does not require each dataconference participant to have a personal computer, vitiating the necessity for participants to configure network connections. This unconventional move away from computer-centered networking provides a novel approach to dataconferencing.

In contrast, *Begis* fails to teach the invention of claim 21. Rather, *Begis* discloses a system for “computer session synchronization,” the system including components such as switch **310**, telephone **110** (or **305**), and computer **105** (or **325**) to provide various functionalities. See *Begis*, Title (*Out-of-Band Signaling for Network Based Computer Session Synchronization*); see also 5:63-6:21; Fig. 3A. As conceded in the Office Action, however, nowhere does *Begis* disclose an apparatus comprising a housing adapted to incorporate an adapter, an input key, a network interface, an image processor, and a projector into an **integrated dataconferencing appliance**. Rather, *Begis*’s system consists of various dissociated components, none of which are incorporated into an integrated dataconferencing appliance.

Morley fails to remedy the deficiency of *Begis*. *Morley* is directed to a system eliminating the need to distribute celluloid film to movie theaters or remote auditoriums by providing a central hub **102** and a theater subsystem **104**, the theater subsystem **104** storing a video sent to it by the central hub **102** for later playback. See, e.g., *Morley*, 7:63-8:1-4; 8:17-58. Nowhere does *Morley* disclose an integrated dataconferencing

apparatus. Thus, at a minimum, it is impossible for *Morley* to disclose a housing adapted to incorporate an adapter, an input key, a network interface, an image processor, and a projector into an integrated dataconferencing apparatus. Therefore, *Begis* and *Morley*, whether individually or in combination, fail to teach the elements of claim 21.

Furthermore, not only does *Morley* fail to remedy the deficiency of *Begis*, but one skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify *Begis* in view of *Morley* to arrive at the apparatus of claim 21. It is well established that in order to rely on a reference as a basis for a § 103 rejection, the reference must be either in the field of the applicant's endeavor or reasonably pertinent to the problem with which the claimed invention is concerned. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446, 24 U.S.P.Q.2s 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

At a minimum, *Morley* is irrelevant to either the claimed invention or to *Begis*. *Morley* discloses a system for eliminating the need to distribute celluloid film to theaters or remote auditoriums by providing a central hub **102** and a theater subsystem **104**, the theater subsystem **104** storing a video sent to it by the central hub **102** for later playback. See, e.g., *Morley*, 7:63-8:1-4; 8:17-58. *Morley* is simply inapplicable to real-time communication or dataconferencing. As *Morley* is not pertinent to dataconferencing, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Accordingly, claim 21 is allowable over *Begis* even when combined with *Morley*. In addition, claim 29 contains similar limitations as those set forth in claim 21 and is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 22, 24-28, 30, and 32 depend from and add additional features to claim 21. Therefore, by virtue of their dependency, claims 22, 24-28, 30, and 32 are also patentable over *Begis* even when combined with *Morley*.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims 21-30 and 32 are presented in allowable form. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2972.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: 12/05/2006

/Angela M. Sagalewicz/

Angela M. Sagalewicz

Reg. No. 56113

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981